



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

mand which was made by the Washington convention, over which Secretary Foster presided in 1904. That is statesmanship; and with the firm establishment of a few things in that line, the battleship will become a useless and impertinent thing. If the United States will take the leadership in insisting upon a few great things of this character, it will be leading in that for which the world waits.

Memorial of One Hundred and Forty-Four Members of the House of Commons on the Burden of Armaments.

[Following is the full text of the Memorial on Armaments signed by one hundred and forty-four members of the British Parliament and presented to the Prime Minister on July 30.]

Sir: An appeal was addressed last year to the late Prime Minister by a number of his supporters in the House of Commons in favor of a reduction in expenditure on armaments. The knowledge that there will be a renewed demand for an increase next year on the current rate of expenditure seems to justify us in now making a similar appeal to you. We make it in a spirit of sincere loyalty to you as our leader, and with an assured confidence that our views will receive a careful and sympathetic consideration.

In the Budget statement for the year 1906-07 you took a larger survey of our financial situation than is usual on these occasions, and you took it in the hope that it might impress upon the House, as it had impressed on you, a much needed lesson. You went back ten years for your starting-point. The population of the United Kingdom, which in the middle of 1896 was 39,600,000, had risen in the middle of 1906 to 43,600,000 — an increase of ten per cent. The national expenditure on imperial account had increased during the same period by £40,300,000, or thirty-nine per cent. Of this increase, as much as £21,000,000 was to be put down to the army and the navy. In 1896-97 the numbers voted for the army were 156,000 and the cost was £18,270,000. In 1906-07 the numbers voted were 204,000 and the cost was £29,796,000 — an increase in numbers of over thirty per cent and in cost of over sixty-three per cent. For the navy the numbers borne in 1896-97 were 91,500, and the cost was £22,170,000. In 1906-07 the numbers were 129,000, and the cost £31,869,000 — an increase in numbers of forty-one per cent and in cost of forty-three per cent. You also alluded to the cost of the Civil Service, and said in conclusion, with regard to the survey as a whole, that the figures appeared to you to call for no comment; they spoke with an eloquence that needed no rhetorical embroidery. In your opinion they made it the first and paramount duty of the Government to return to a more thrifty and economical administration.

This survey which we have ventured to recall to your mind gives us a large part of the case we now desire to present to you. For the rest we ground ourselves, first on the accepted principle that armaments depend upon policy, and secondly on the fact that since 1903 this country has been pursuing with preëminent success a policy of peace. Since that year we have, under the guidance both of Lord Lansdowne and Sir Edward Grey, established relations with foreign powers which have by

common consent removed many of the dangers with which we were previously confronted. The burden of our complaint is that there has been no corresponding reduction in expenditure on armaments.

The most difficult task with which the Government will have to deal in the immediate future is the apportionment of the resources of the nation to its several needs. This indeed is at all times the most difficult task of statesmanship. But the long rule of the Conservative party, their lavish expenditure on armaments, and their neglect of the domestic needs of the country have added enormously to it. Difficult, however, as it no doubt is, we are convinced that the welfare of the country demands that a resolute effort should be made to grapple with it in accordance with the traditional policy of the Liberal party, and that the permanent sources of our strength — the prosperity and contentment of our people — should no longer be sacrificed to the maintenance of military and naval establishments not clearly called for by the exigencies of our situation in the world.

In conclusion, we desire to acknowledge with gratitude the efforts that were made before and during the Hague Conference to induce other nations to consent to a reduction of armaments, and though our present appeal does not stand or fall with the success or failure of those efforts, we would respectfully urge that the present moment is eminently propitious for a renewal of them.

What Must Follow the Hague Conference.

William T. Stead, of London, writing on the above topic in a recent number of the *Independent*, says:

"The first great unfinished task of the Conference was the elaboration of a project of an International Court of Arbitral Justice. The idea was accepted by all the powers. The scheme for the constitution and procedure of the court was agreed to with equal unanimity, with one important exception. At the Conference it was impossible to obtain unanimity for any scheme for selecting judges. An irreconcilable difference appeared between advocates of the sovereign right of every state, regardless of its might or its area, to an equal voice in the selection of judges, and the advocates of what may be described as the principle of force, who maintained that the powers which dominated the world at present by virtue of their strength and wealth should be allowed corresponding dominance in the nomination of the judges of this world tribunal. The question as to how the judges should be elected was declared insoluble by the Conference, but it was relegated to the attention of the forty-four governments therein represented. The first duty which lies immediately before all the governments, and especially before the government of the United States, which took an honorable initiative at The Hague in proposing the constitution of the court, is to consider whether, with the inner light of the discussions of last year, it is possible for them to devise some scheme which would reconcile the opposing views. There is reason to believe that after the period of reflection which began when the Conference ended, Mr. Root and Dr. Barbosa, to mention two of the leading minds which have been engaged upon the consideration of this problem, may have discovered some method by which the idea of state sovereignty may be

harmonized with the actual facts of the aggregation of force which makes eight or nine powers practically the rulers of the world.

"It is quite possible for the American Republics to take the project of the Hague Conference and set up a Court of Arbitral Justice, according to the constitution and with the procedure approved at The Hague, for their own use, without waiting for the adhesion of the other powers. The Court can be brought into being without waiting for the unanimous assent of all the governments. It is always within the sovereign discretion of any state to deprive itself and its subjects of the advantages of such an International Court of Arbitral Justice. If it does not agree to come in, it can stand outside. There are many advantages which might arise from an initiative of this kind being taken in the western hemisphere. Public sentiment in the Americas is much more advanced in the direction of international arbitration than it is in the older world. If the Americas decided to bring the Court of Arbitral Justice into being it is probable that several of the smaller European states, and possibly some of the Asiatic, might adhere, and in this way a court might be created which would represent the whole of the western world and all the more advanced nations in Europe. There is nothing to bar progress in this direction except an agreement as to selection of judges. Should the initiative be taken west of the Atlantic, the seat of the International Arbitral Court of Justice would naturally be in the first instance in the western hemisphere, instead of being located, as proposed, at The Hague. This is an additional inducement to the American people to take an initiative in the matter.

"The second subject upon which the Hague Conference ripened opinion without arriving at unanimous decision to act was that of obligatory arbitration. In principle all the governments accepted obligatory arbitration; but thirty-one powers, including the United States and Great Britain, were in favor of establishing this principle by a general world-wide treaty, while the minority, headed by Germany, objected to a world-wide treaty, and declared their conviction that more rapid progress toward universal obligatory arbitration would be made by separate treaties between each other. Germany was the chief champion of the latter idea. Baron Marschall was never weary of inveighing against the idea that the petty Central American Republics could be treated on the same footing as the greater civilized states of the world. After innumerable discussions and many efforts to arrive at a unanimous agreement upon the basis of a general treaty, it was found at the end that thirty-one powers were willing to accept obligatory arbitration upon only eight subjects, many of which were only of small importance. It was generally understood, although not publicly declared, that the thirty-one powers who found themselves in agreement would be invited by the French government to enter into a general treaty among themselves, which might, in the first instance, be limited to the eight points upon which agreement had been arrived at, but which could be capable of infinite extension by the addition of other articles as public opinion ripened. France has as yet made no sign of any intention to move in that direction, but should the French delay much longer, it would be well for the American government to move toward practical action.

"It may be well here to explain the difference between international arbitration as it at present exists and the new system which would be created if the Court of Arbitral Justice were constituted, and thirty-one, or any greater or smaller number, of powers bound themselves to submit questions in dispute without raising the reserves which they maintain for all other subjects affecting national honor and independence, or vital national interests. At present, even when nations have entered into a treaty of obligatory arbitration between themselves, if either of the parties refuses to go to arbitration there is no appeal to any outside authority, whereas, after the Court of Arbitral Justice had been created and was in session, if any power that was a party to a treaty of obligatory arbitration, general or particular, were to refuse to arbitrate a dispute on any of the subjects included in that treaty, the other disputant would appeal to the International Court of Arbitration, which could summon the recalcitrant power to submit to its jurisdiction. The changes foreshadowed by the Hague Conference would make all the difference between the voluntary agreement of private persons to arbitrate when it suits them and the obligation under which all citizens are liable to, of being summoned, against their will, to prove the justice of their case when any dispute arises.

"These two questions — the constitution of a Court of Arbitral Justice and the framing of a general Treaty of Obligatory Arbitration — are immeasurably the most important tasks which were bequeathed by the Conference to the governments of the world. The sooner they are taken in hand the better. By no government and by no people can they be taken in hand more appropriately than by the government and people of the United States."

The Freedom of Commerce in Time of War.

A Concise Statement of the Question of Immunity from Capture of Private Property at Sea.

BY JAMES L. TRYON.

"The private property of all citizens of signatory powers, with the exception of contraband of war, shall be exempt on the high seas or elsewhere from capture or seizure by the armed vessels or military forces of said powers. Nothing in this rule implies in any way the inviolability of vessels which shall attempt to enter a port blockaded by the naval forces of said powers, or of the cargo of said vessels." — *The proposition of the American delegation, which failed to pass the second Hague Conference.*

The third Hague Conference should exempt innocent private property at sea from capture in time of war. Complete exemption will be in order later, when the world is ready for it.

What does this mean? The phrasing of the proposition is to the average reader rather hard to understand, and he is inclined to dismiss it as something with which he has no concern. But there is not a man who owns shipping or gets his living from ocean commerce, and indirectly there is not a consumer, but should be interested in this question. People who want to abolish the war system with its moral and economic evils should know what immunity means and be able to explain its relation to the peace and prosperity of the world.